

The Pope and the War

THE ARCHBISHOP OF TORONTO

THE Bark of Peter is passing over troubled seas these war-times. We should not be surprised that she is buffeted by heavy waves. The Catholic Church is the only international Power remaining unbroken by the conflict of nations and empires. International Socialism, Masonry, commercial and scientific organizations, all the bonds which connected men of one nation socially with those of the other nations, are powerless now, excepting one, the Catholic Church. Even the men who assail the Church on account of local issues, if they are thoughtful men, would not willingly see disappear this last organic expression of the brotherhood of man. The accusations which have been circulated in Canada against the Catholic Church have reference chiefly to the position and the attitude of his Holiness the Pope.

THE POSITION OF THE POPE

The Pope is necessarily neutral in this war. He is in justice obliged to be impartial. Catholics are patriotic in their respective countries. The war has made this clear. Whether right or wrong in judgment, they are convinced of the justice of their respective countries' cause, whether French or German. If the Pope publicly condemned either group of belligerents at the outbreak of war or at any stage of it, he would thereby place many millions of Catholics in the agonizing necessity of choosing between their Church and their Country, and he would favor one section of the Church at the expense of another. The war would go on in any case. Civil war would add to its horrors, for all countries are divided in religion, and the remedy would only increase the disease. Besides, a public condemnation would involve a judicial investigation, and this is practically impossible in war times. The Pope has publicly condemned particular acts of cruelty and injustice, like the invasion of Belgium; but

as to the war in general, he is strictly neutral. One proof of his impartiality is the fact that he is abused by daily newspapers and prominent individuals of both sides. I need not cite instances on the side of the Allies. Most people have seen or heard accusations to the effect that the Pope is pro-German, that he is responsible for the defeat of the Italian army, etc. About four months ago Herr Lahusen, a prominent Evangelical leader in Germany, said:

We will not forget that the strength of Prussia and of Germany lies in the Gospel. As Frederick William I said, "We here are Protestants to the bone," and Bismarck's phrases are still true about our Evangelical Protestant *Kaisertum*. We do not interfere with our Catholic brethren, letting themselves be guided in their faith by the head of their Church; but we in Germany want nothing to do with a Holy Father who would have a say in our politics. We want nothing to do with a mediation to give us peace; we want to win our peace with the sharp sword which was dedicated by Luther.—*London Tablet*.

The semi-official *Kölnische Zeitung* said a year ago:

Whereas in the spring of 1915, the Curia was almost unanimously against Italy's entry into the war, but was nevertheless neutral, today, in consequence of the untiring propaganda of the Allied powers, the majority of the authoritative personages at the Vatican may be described as in full agreement with the Italian policy.

The *Vossische Zeitung* says:

What really plays the authoritative and decisive role at the Vatican is Italian nationality, which is closely allied to the French. They feel, think and work there as Italians and Romans. It is hopeless to think of paralyzing the anti-German Romanism of the Vatican.

These are but samples of many similar things said and published in Germany during 1917, while in England the *London Times* was maintaining that the tenor of the Pope's Peace note bore the mark of German inspiration, and the *Globe* was referring to the "foolish buzzings of the Vatican." A neutral Power which tries to lessen the horrors of war is always likely to be so treated by representatives of opposing belligerents; but the Governments of these belligerent nations evidenced their confidence in the Pope's impartiality by accepting him as mediator in negotiations resulting in notable improvement in the condition of many prisoners of war. Following is a summary statement of these negotiations:

A proposal for the general exchange of prisoners unfit for military service was made by his Holiness to the Sovereigns and heads of States of the belligerent Powers on December 31, 1914. All the Governments accepted, but in practice it was only found possible to carry out the exchange as between France, Belgium, Great Britain and Russia on the one side and Germany on the other. An agreement was subsequently concluded between Italy and Austro-Hungary and has been in operation for some time past.

The Pope then took up the question of invalid and wounded prisoners, and in May, 1915, opened negotiations with the belligerent States with a view to such prisoners being interned in neutral countries. The negotiations with the French, Swiss and German Governments were successful, and several thousands of these prisoners have been interned and tended in Switzerland.

In 1915 the Pope made a further appeal in order that they should agree to allow the strict observance of Sunday rest for prisoners of war. All the Governments adhered to his proposal.

In April, 1916, the Pope put forward a plan for interning in a neutral country, after eighteen months' captivity, the fathers of at least three children. The Vatican warmly urged the matter, but negotiations have been delayed owing to certain practical difficulties. Nevertheless it has been found possible to accommodate a certain number of these prisoners in Switzerland by way of experiment, and it is hoped that before long arrangements will be made on a larger scale. His Holiness also secured the release of very many Belgian civilians who had been deported to Germany.

On the 12th of August, 1915, Sir Henry Howard, representing the British Government at the Vatican, was instructed to express "the warm thanks of his Britannic Majesty for the humanitarian and efficacious action of his Holiness."

THE POPE AND BELGIUM

On the 4th of August, 1914, the Chancellor of Germany recognized that in the invasion of Belgium, Germany had committed "an injustice," maintaining, however, that, under the circumstances, it could not have been avoided. On the 22nd of the following January

Pope Benedict XV spoke publicly at the Vatican and said:

It belongs to the Roman Pontiff, whom God appointed supreme interpreter and vindicator of His law, to proclaim before all that no possible reason can make licit any violations of justice.

The official representative of Belgium at the Vatican, M. Van den Heuvel, inquired whether these words of his Holiness had reference to Belgium, and he received the following reply from the Papal Secretary of State:

The violation of the neutrality of Belgium, carried out by Germany, on the admission of her own Chancellor, contrary to international law, was certainly one of "those injustices" which the Holy Father strongly reprobates.

The Holy See is the only neutral Power which has protested against the invasion of Belgium. Referring to the Pope's words and the Cardinal's letter, the influential *Hamburger Fremdenblatt* of January 29, 1917, says: "The one belligerent Power against which the Vatican has officially spoken is Germany."

This was not a violation of neutrality. The fact that Belgium was not in either of the belligerent groups until forced by invasion, made its case exceptional, and the German Chancellor's admission gave occasion to condemn the proposition that the end justifies the means, even when the end is the safety of the German Empire.

On the 25th of April, 1915, Cardinal Mercier issued to the people of Belgium a long pastoral on "Devotion to Christ and to His Divine Mother," in which he said:

From the beginning of the war certain cunning, evil, and treacherous minds have persisted in encouraging the rumor that the late Pope, Pius X, and our Holy Father Benedict XV, gave help and moral approval to our enemies, and, through weakness, did an injustice to the rights of the Belgian people. These are calumnies, my Brethren—nothing but infamous calumnies. The simple, loving, generous heart of Pius X was incapable, I will not say of any cowardice, but of so much as the appearance of an accommodation with injustice, even though it were triumphant. The truth is that the noble old man succumbed to the grief that overcame him, when he saw the European nations rent by murderous war, and Providence left him no time to express in public the holy horror these orgies of blood inspired in him.

As for our Holy Father, Pope Benedict XV., what could he do for the Belgians that he had not done? His very first Pontifical blessing was for us, and he charged me to bring it to

you in his name. On two occasions he was good enough to send generous donations to Belgium, in spite of the poverty of his resources. In his fatherly goodness he addressed to us two letters of consolation designed for you. Add to this his resolute and noble Consistorial Allocution of the 22nd of January; his answers to the telegrams of the King and the Government; that to M. Van den Heuvel; the support he afforded us through his Apostolic Nuncio in Brussels—and if, after all this, Belgium is still not satisfied, I am afraid her spiritual piety tempts her to excess of spiritual hunger.

In July, 1915, the Pope granted an interview to M. Laudet, editor of the *Revue Hebdomadaire* (Paris), for the purpose of correcting a false report published in *La Liberté* by M. Latapie. In this his Holiness said:

At the beginning of the bombardment of the Cathedral of Reims we charged the Cardinal Archbishop of Cologne to convey our protest to the German Emperor. . . . I condemn strongly the martyrdom of the poor Belgian priests and so many other horrors on which light has been cast.

Belgium is not the only country in which Catholic priests and bishops were harshly treated. In Galicia the Archbishop of Lemberg was deported to Russia and imprisoned, while his priests were coerced for the purpose of making them join the Russian Church. The Holy Father had to take all such facts into account.

THE POPE AND AUSTRIA-HUNGARY

In a population of fifty millions in Austria-Hungary about thirty-four millions are Catholic. From these the Pope rightly expects ecclesiastical obedience; but from the Austrian Government he does not expect political support. Catholics do not confound religion with politics or with State policy. It is not a rare phenomenon to see the majority of a people Catholic and their government unfriendly to the Church. This results partly from the international character of the Catholic Church. No civil government is naturally inclined to favor a strong international organization which affects its interests. After three and a half years of war, and under the pressure of evident necessity, the Allies have effected a partial international direction of military forces. British particularism accepted this very reluctantly. An appeal to national feeling against the arrangement created a crisis in Par-

liament. The Catholic Church is an international organization, and always has to reckon with the national jealousies which beget exclusiveness in national governments. Christ proclaimed a divided allegiance when He said: "Give unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." Allegiance in the things of God had hitherto been given to Caesar everywhere. In all countries, whether Jewish or Gentile, there was, not union of Church and State in cooperation, but unity of Church and State. They were combined in one institution. Christ proclaimed a separation of powers, leaving civil sovereignty to Caesar and giving sovereignty in religious matters to the Church He founded on the Rock. Caesar has never ceased to resent this curtailing of his power. The tendency to revert to pre-Christian conditions, and to restore sovereignty in religious matters to the State, is very strong, even in Catholic countries, and it sometimes takes the form of ignoring religion altogether in official acts, and of using education as a substitute. Where this tendency overpowers opposition it results in national churches. Austria is largely a Catholic country, and its Government has often sought to use religion as an instrument of rule or of expansion; but the very idea of becoming itself an instrument of Papal policy is as abhorrent to the Austrian Government as the thought of a French generalissimo controlling the British armies is to the British people. The following is taken from the *Toronto Globe* of August 1, 1870:

The evacuation of Rome by the French troops in September next, and the entrance of the Italians into the Holy City in their room, seems to be no longer doubtful. Not only have the French and Italians come to an understanding in the matter, but Austria fully assents to the arrangement.

In 1867 the Austrian Chancellor Beust "warmly urged that Italy should be allowed to occupy Papal territory," and when in 1870 Rome was taken by the Italian army, Austria accepted the Italian Law of Guarantees as sufficient protection for the Holy See. At the Congress of Vienna in 1815 the Austrian representative, Count Metternich, proposed on behalf of Austria, "to abolish the Temporal Power of the Pope in her favor." At that time Austria was in possession of northern Italy. In the Papal

Conclave of 1903 the Austrian Government interfered with the independence of the Church by vetoing the election of Cardinal Rampolla, using an ancient privilege which Pius X afterwards abolished. Authorities for the foregoing statements of fact are given in No. 26 of an Anglican series called "The York Books." The evident inference is that it is not to the Government of Austria the Pope can look for political support in any project to restore the States of the Church.

THE POPE AND GERMANY

The Pope pro-German! This party cry is used by those who seek the most unpopular attitude they can find in any period to attribute to the Pope. Before the war he was, according to them, the enemy of science or of liberty or whatever happened to be most prized at a given time. Now he is, of course, against the Allies, according to them. Others there are who do not hate the Pope, but find that it pays to misrepresent him.

The well-informed see how impossible it is for the Pope to be other than impartially neutral in this war. I have before me a large volume published in 1913, giving the population of every Catholic diocese and mission in the world. Its statistics are conservative as compared with those of the 1914 number of the "Statesman's Year Book." From it we learn that the Central Powers, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey, have 57,466,130 Catholics. The Allied Powers are France, the British Isles, Italy, Belgium, Portugal, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Newfoundland, and the United States. In these countries the Catholic population is 111,089,571. That is, the Catholic population of the Allies is nearly double that of the Central Powers. With such vast numbers of Catholics on both sides, the Pope is necessarily neutral. It would be inconsistent with his position to antagonize the patriotism of more than a hundred million Catholics in the Allied nations.

The Allies are not the first to come into conflict with German *Kultur*. Thirty to forty years ago the Catholic Church in Germany went through a fierce combat, which Bismarck called the *Kulturkampf*. The Church had the

choice of becoming thoroughly Germanized or of continuing to be international, and she chose the latter. Bismarck wanted the former. He confiscated Church property, discontinued salaries to the clergy, and suppressed the supervision which the Church had exercised in Catholic schools. In 1880, 1,770 priests had fallen victims of the new laws in prison, banishment, or heavy fines, besides the expelled members of Religious Orders. Three hundred Catholic institutions were closed. Bishops were imprisoned or banished. All this took place after a successful war with France, and we are asked to believe that the Pope finds nothing but satisfaction in thinking of the years following a successful war against France and her Allies!

The following is a paragraph of the Pope's Peace note dated August 1, 1917:

First, the fundamental point should be that the moral force of right should replace the material force of arms; hence a just agreement between all for the simultaneous and reciprocal diminution of armaments, according to rules and guarantees to be established, to the extent necessary and sufficient for the maintenance of public order in each State; then, in the place of armies, the establishment of arbitration with its exalted pacifying functions, on lines to be concerted and with sanctions to be settled against any State that should refuse either to submit international questions to arbitration or to accept its awards.

The adoption of this would mean the end of militarism. An armed force restricted to the work of maintaining order within each nation would be radically different from an army formed by conscription for defense against external powers. An instance of the former is the Royal Constabulary in Ireland, and of the latter, the German or the French army. If the Pope were pro-German, would he propose the abolition of conscription in times of peace? In a letter addressed to the Archbishop of Sens, France, the Papal Secretary of State remarked as follows on this paragraph of the Peace note:

Conscription has, for more than a century, been the cause of a multitude of evils to society. The true remedy is a simultaneous and reciprocal suppression. Once abolished, it could only be revived by a law, and such a law would have to be passed by Parliament. This would be the case in the Central Empires, even with their present constitutions. Now, the con-

sent of Parliament would be very improbable for many reasons, especially in view of the painful experience of the present war. In this way the peace treaties would have the guarantee of popular support. On the other hand, if the right of declaring war were reserved to the people by way of *referendum*, or at least to Parliament, international peace would be assured as far as it can be assured in this world.

Evidently, it is not to the Kaiser or other rulers that the Vatican looks for support in its peace policy, but to the people.

THE POPE AND ITALY

Italy took Rome from the Pope in 1870, leaving him the Vatican and the buildings used as offices of administration. The King of Italy has since resided in a palace built as a Papal residence in the sixteenth century, the Quirinal. This was the end of what is often called the Temporal Power of the Pope, and more correctly, the States of the Church. For a thousand years, with few interruptions, the States of the Church had served a definite purpose. They were a means to an end. The purpose was the civil independence of the Pope in his relations with the Catholics of different nations. The Catholics of any nation naturally object if there is reason to suspect that the Government of another nation can influence the Holy See in making appointments or in other acts of administration. Like the President of the United States in the District of Columbia, the Pope needs to be on neutral ground. A hundred years ago there was a proposal connected with the securing of Catholic emancipation in Great Britain and Ireland, to the effect that the British Government should have a voice in the appointment of Catholic Bishops in Ireland. The Catholics of Ireland agitated against this proposal until it was dropped. Not only must the Pope be free in this respect; he also needs to be above suspicion of partiality as between different nations. He had his District of Columbia in the States of the Church, a portion of central Italy, of which he was King. When he lost the States of the Church he had recourse to other means of civil independence. He discontinued diplomatic relations with the Kingdom of Italy, and kept up such a protest against the Italian Government that the Catholics of other nations could not sus-

pect collusion between him and the civil power of Italy. The success of this means of self-defense on the part of the Pope was shown in the conflict between Church and State in France in the years 1901-7. At that time Italy was an ally of Germany. The alliance with Austria was never welcome to the people of Italy, but the alliance with Germany was. If the French Government had succeeded in making the Catholics of France suspect that Germany's Ally was able to influence the central administration of the Church, the result might have been disastrous; but no such result followed. The Catholics of France accepted dutifully the decision of the Pope in the case as that of an unbiased Church Court of supreme authority. Since 1870 every succeeding Pope has demanded a guarantee of civil independence—not necessarily a territorial guarantee, but some international arrangement to serve the purpose which the States of the Church served. The present situation is unsatisfactory. It antagonizes the people of Italy; it confines the Pope to the Vatican; and the war shows it to be insufficient in other respects. There are now probably many in Germany and Austria who doubt the impartiality of the Pope as regards Italy. When Italy declared war in 1915, the *Montreal Gazette* said:

The entry of Italy into the war will make the position of the Pope peculiarly difficult. He will be at once cut off from direct communication with Austria, which is one of the world's strongest Catholic countries, as well as with a great number of South German adherents of his Church. He will be able to maintain correspondence, no doubt, with the Bishops in the countries hostile to Italy, but it will be by slow and indirect means, and his messages may be opened and censored. Such a situation was foreseen in 1870, and though it has taken forty-five years to see its realization, it will be none the less awkward. A neutral seat is necessary for the freedom of a Church whose membership is international.

The Pope's first duty is to safeguard the unity of the Church, as far as he can. The Church is not an Italian institution. It is Catholic. The outlook of daily life at the Vatican is world-wide. In Italian Government circles the outlook is intensely national. The cosmopolitan and the national points of view sometimes clash. The Italian Government assumes that the freedom of the Pope in

the administration of the Church is a purely Italian matter, and that the guarantees sanctioned by the Parliament of Italy to that effect are sufficient. The Pope acts on the assumption that this is an international affair, and that what one Italian Parliament guarantees, another may refuse to guarantee. This is a fundamental difficulty between the Holy See and the Kingdom of Italy, and accounts for much that is offensive to Catholics in the tone of the Italian press. But, as far as the war is concerned, the Pope is impartial in his attitude to all nations, Italy included. In June, 1915, the Cardinal Secretary of State at the Vatican stated through the *Corriere d'Italia*, of Rome, that "The Holy See does not wish to create embarrassments for the Italian Government, . . . and looks not to foreign armies, but to the sense of justice . . . among the people of Italy in conformity with its true interests." On December 9, 1915, the Pope recognized in a public address that "those who govern Italy are not wanting in good intentions to eliminate the inconveniences" of his present position. In November, 1917, the Italian army suffered a severe defeat at the hands of the Germans. The principal cause of the defeat was a disruptive propaganda among Italian soldiers. The parties responsible for the success of the propaganda are indicated in a special cable to the *Toronto Mail and Empire* of December 26, as follows:

Rome, Dec. 25.—During yesterday's stormy debate in Parliament interesting revelations were made in connection with the military disaster in November which was attributed mainly to the Socialists' anti-war propaganda among the soldiers. Specific evidence was adduced that soldiers were incited to desert and were persuaded that peace was inevitable if they did not resist. Deputy Colajanni also blamed Giolitti, the former Premier, whose absence justified the belief that he disapproved of and was opposed to the war. The Socialists interrupted the orators and blamed General Cadorna, the former commander-in-chief, but they were shouted down by the majority and their leader, Deputy Turati, was prevented from explaining that the weak resistance of the army was due to bad leadership.

During this debate a member named Pirolini tried to place some of the blame on the clergy. To him the Prime Minister of Italy replied:

I deplore the accusations of a general character made by the Hon. Signor Pirlini against high ecclesiastical personages—ac-

cusations that tend to hurt the supreme spiritual authority—against priests and against the Catholic party. Such accusations are unjust and offensive because, as the public are aware, the Italian clergy, both high and low, have given noble and beautiful proofs of Italian sentiments, and the great mass of the Catholics have known how to reconcile the dictates of faith with their duties toward their country.

It seems to be a fact that the Teutonic agents made use of the Pope's Peace note in this propaganda. They use anything they can think of to serve their purpose. At present they are using a Bible agency in Canada. But, in the case of the Peace note, it should be remembered that the Pope did not intend its publication. It was sent to the belligerent Governments through diplomatic channels, and the Foreign Department of one of the Allied Governments published it. The Cardinal Secretary of State issued a manly statement on this phase of the subject, as follows:

The malicious insinuations propagated in America, and the tendency to attribute in great part to the Italian clergy the responsibility for the present situation, must be denounced. In Italy no fair-minded person is attributing the situation to the clergy. When disruptive propaganda began to affect the morale of the Italian army, the clergy in general and the army chaplains in particular, following the instructions of the chaplain-in-chief, labored to counteract it and elevate the morale of the troops. More than once the army chaplains informed the chaplain-in-chief of the situation, and he in turn informed the supreme civil authorities of the disruptive movement that was creeping in, and all this long before the publication of the Papal note. The true causes of the recent Italian reverses are perfectly well understood in Italy, and the shoulders on which rests the responsibility for such reverses are well known, a responsibility which certainly does not touch Catholics, clergy, and least of all the august person of the Sovereign Pontiff. And if there did happen to be a single incident to deplore in this respect, namely, the case of a Catholic paper which published an article containing imprudent observations, the Holy See at once ordered the suppression of that paper, although the writer was subsequently acquitted by a military tribunal with the verdict of "not guilty." Finally, is it necessary to repeat that the Pontifical appeal, which some have so ignorantly criticized, was addressed to the chiefs of Governments for consideration in official chancelleries? Governmental authorities first gave it to the press and public. The Holy See published and commented on it in the *Osservatore Romano*, the Vatican's official organ, only when the false interpretations of others, whether innocent or wilful, necessitated such action.

In his Christmas address his Holiness referred to the taking of Jerusalem from the Turks as an answer to the age-long prayer of the Fathers by "giving back to the Christian Faith the Holy Places and the venerated soil where the blood of the Redeemer was poured out." German papers condemned this utterance as a violation of Papal neutrality. The *Münchener Neueste Nachrichten* thinks that "the Entente is exploiting the words of Pope Benedict to the fullest extent." The Pope's words are certainly not exploited in Ontario. The correspondent of the *Toronto Daily Star* in Italy has two columns of anti-Papal prejudice in the issue of February 16, the tenor of which is indicated by the headlines: "Vatican Ignored Capture of Jerusalem by British. Catholic Organ Dismissed News Curtly, While Other Papers Published Columns of Enthusiastic Comment—Belated Effort to Remedy Omission." Well, here is part of the comment of one of the Catholic daily papers published in Rome, the *Corriere d'Italia*, the day after the taking of Jerusalem.

The victory of the Allied nations in the Holy Land is a Christian victory. Christ triumphs over Mussulman impiety and Lutheran pride. Against us, against Christ, who now returns triumphant with our banners, Turk and German have fought to defend an iniquitous usurpation, a shameful profanation. Mahomet and Martin Luther joined against the new Crusade. The nation which in Belgium and France devastated churches and overthrew altars in hatred of the Catholic Faith, has crossed its flag and its arms with the crescent and scimitar in support of the wrong done by Saladin, before whose tomb the German monarch bowed his proud head in an act of protection which was pretended submission aiming at his world-empire dream. The shameful alliance in the Holy Land has been defeated. Christ has overcome Mahomet and Luther, and rises anew symbolically from His sepulchre.

The fact is that the victory in Jerusalem was notified to the Holy See officially by the British Ambassador at the Vatican, and the Pope sent a reply to the British Government through the Ambassador. The British Government is free to publish that reply and show whether the "Vatican ignored the capture of Jerusalem by the British."

Rome is the only great capital of Europe, in which the most influential personage has neither civil nor mili-

tary authority. The Quirinal is overshadowed by the Vatican. The attitude of Italy towards the Pope is a compound of love, reverence, fear, and hate. He is not despised by any class of citizens. The Socialists would probably destroy the Vatican if they could. The Government of Italy does not wish to see the Pope leave Rome, but does wish to see his international authority diminished. Government circles look upon the Vatican as a national institution which refuses to conform to their wishes.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

The Holy Father is assailed on all sides. Why did he not do this, and why did he not protest against that? "Even that noble person, Cardinal Mercier, received a very cold welcome when he came from Belgium to Rome," says the *Star* correspondent. Either Cardinal Mercier or the *Star* correspondent states an untruth. The Cardinal knows what took place, and he is incapable of conscious falsehood. In his Lenten pastoral of 1916 he tells how he was received at the Vatican in the following words:

Our Holy Father showed me the most touching kindness. As soon as I arrived, he deigned to fold me in his arms; he invited me to come and see him as often as possible; he allowed me to tell him everything, to confide in him fully, to think aloud before him. During the many hours I had the consolation of spending in his august presence, he comforted, illuminated, and encouraged me paternally. He understands and shares our anxieties concerning our religious liberties and our patriotic feelings. He was good enough to sum up his profound thought on your behalf, which I received most eagerly, in the inscription traced by his own august hand beneath his portrait; I here transcribe it for you in all simplicity:

"To our revered brother, Cardinal Mercier, Archbishop of Mechlin. We give the Apostolic Blessing with all our heart, assuring him that We are always with him, and that We share his grief and his anguish, inasmuch as his cause is our cause."

The hollow hypocrisy of the campaign against the Pope can only be realized when we consider the fact that in April, 1915, four great Powers of Europe bound themselves by treaty to make void any efforts of the Pope in the interest of peace. The clause referring to the Pope is thus worded:

Art. XV. France, England, and Russia obligate themselves to support Italy in her desire for non-admittance of the Holy See to any kind of diplomatic steps for the purpose of the conclusion of peace or the regulation of questions arising from the present war.

Art. XVI stipulates that "this treaty must be kept secret," and the concluding words are:

The undersigned have set their hands and seals at London in four copies the 26th day of April, 1915.

GREY,
CAMBON,
IMPERIALI,
BENCKENDORF.

The new rulers of Russia repudiated this and other treaties which they published. It was not any suspicion on the part of the Allied Governments regarding the impartial neutrality of the Pope, that led to Art. XV. The motive was the demand and the supposed interest of the Government of Italy, which urged it as a means of consolidating the occupation of Rome and the States of the Church. For the same reason and by similar means the Italian Government secured the rejection of Russia's proposal to place a nominee of the Pope on the Hague Tribunal several years before the war, when there was no question of pro-German or anti-German. Both Alsace-Lorraine and the States of the Church changed hands in consequence of the war of 1870. The next peace conference would deal with the former, and Italy dreads the raising of any question about the latter. But now that the secret treaty is made public, the Pope must be discredited at all costs. He must be made to appear pro-German, indifferent to the moral issues involved, careless about the fate or the sufferings of Belgium, etc. Catholics need to be on their guard against the insidious persistence of this campaign. It is fundamentally false, but deals with matters which are not well or widely known. Remember that the number of Catholics in the Allied nations is, in round numbers, one hundred and ten millions, while the number of Catholics in the Central countries is fifty-seven millions. This bare fact suffices to show that the Pope is necessarily and strictly impartial. National sentiment and the influence of civil governments

have at times drawn millions away from the Church, even when there was no war, and the Holy See is ever watchfully on guard against this danger. Now that the forces in question are at highest tension in the greatest of all wars, it is absurd, on the face of it, to say that the Holy See is intent on anything but the unity of the Church. Prince Bismarck summed up in a few words the outcome of his conflict with the Church during the *Kulturkampf*. He said that it had been thereby proved that the Pope is not a foreigner in Germany. In 1850 the Pope established the Hierarchy in England, giving boundaries for the different Catholic dioceses, and making Westminster the metropolitan see. There was such an outcry in England against this proceeding that Parliament was constrained to legislate on the subject of ecclesiastical titles. The *Times* had many violent articles on this "foreign aggression." The following sample will give an idea of their tenor:

The selection of Westminster, the very seat of the Court and Parliament of England, and the appropriation by a *foreign priest* or potentate of the time-honored name . . . is a most ostentatious interference with the rights and associations to which we, as a nation, are most unanimously and devotedly attached.

This expression of national feeling was natural enough. England had lost the idea of organic unity as proper to the Church of Christ, and time was needed to accustom the people to the thought that the Pope is not a foreigner in any country. Today the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster is a highly esteemed subject of his Majesty, and the Pope is no longer regarded as a "foreign priest."

The great preoccupation of the Holy See is to prevent divisions in the Church along the lines of national or racial cleavage. The Pope is not now treated as a foreigner in any of the Allied nations. The Catholics in each of them can freely accept his control of Church affairs. It is unthinkable that he would voluntarily endanger or forfeit this position in the Allied nations in return for anything Germany could possibly offer, much less for anything which the Lutheran majority of Germany would allow their rulers to offer. The amount of national and racial hatred in the Christian world at a given time is the measure of the danger to which the unity of the Church is

exposed, and the highest interest of the Holy Father, as the guardian of this unity, is the removal of the causes of hatred by a just and lasting peace.

A recent anti-Papal article in a Toronto paper says that "to argue that the Pope's dominions, or his prerogatives, cover the territory of the other nations—that he is a sort of international sovereign—is a doctrine which no self-respecting nation could accept."

People of this narrow way of thinking are as puzzled about the position of the Pope in the world as if they had lived in the time of Christ and heard Him claim to be a King. A king! What on earth does he mean? Yet Christ claimed to be a King even when it was a question of life or death in the tribunal of Pilate. He was then laying a healing hand upon the nerve-center of fallen humanity, He was separating spiritual sovereignty from civil sovereignty, and assuming the former to Himself in order to impart it later to His Church. After nineteen centuries there are still many educated men in Christendom who stand astonished before the spectacle of the Vicar of Christ claiming spiritual sovereignty. They wonder how national governments can stand such claims; and then, in complete upsetting of their narrow view, the British Government sends an official representative to the Vatican! Let us be reasonable. Caesar never really made a success of spiritual overlordship. The Czar of Russia and his Holy Synod did not confer great spiritual benefits on their country by assuming supreme spiritual power. The Christian separation of Church and State, and the consequent possibility of organic unity in Church government throughout the world, should appeal to men of today as the best solution of this phase of the world's problems. The Christian nations do accept, however grudgingly very often, the doctrine and the practice of Papal sovereignty in spirituals as far as the religion of Catholics is concerned, and in this sense he is, not a "sort of," but a real international sovereign.

Others ask why the Pope waited so long to propose peace. Did he not select the time most suitable to the Central Empires? To the first question I reply that he did not wait. He issued an appeal for peace to the "Belligerent Peoples and Their Rulers" on the first anni-

versary of the outbreak of the war, July 28, 1915. The answer to the second is found in the facts that Russia had collapsed months before the second Papal Peace note was written, that it did not propose a German peace, since its adoption involved the dissolution of German militarism, including the might-is-right doctrine, and that German military strength is still so great that the Allies are putting forth their utmost effort to ward off defeat in the spring of 1918, in which I hope and pray for the success of the Allies.

A good test of the dishonesty of a campaign is the manufacture of evidence without any basis of fact. An elaborate attempt of this kind was made in Rome last month. M. Caillaux was Premier of France several years ago. He was not then, and he has never been, friendly to the Vatican. It seems he is a wealthy man and, in any case, it has been proved that he cares more for wealth than for his country. When he was discredited an effort was made to show that he had intimate relations with certain dignitaries of the Vatican. A man named Leprestre was brought forward to testify to the alleged facts. His story depended on documents said to be at the United States Embassy in Rome. It was assumed possibly that the American Ambassador, Mr. Page, would not interfere. But, when the matter was brought to his attention, Mr. Page said: "The story is the biggest lie possible—no document of the kind has ever come to my knowledge or been sent to Washington; the whole tale was an invention from beginning to end."

Patriots see that a few groups of Catholics in the Allied countries, a few millions in all out of the hundred and ten millions of Catholics involved, are not cooperating with the Allied forces energetically, and conclude that it is all the Pope's doing! This conclusion can only be drawn by one who has no knowledge of the circumstances, and who supplies a link in the chain of inference out of a fund of prejudice. The Pope never instructs us Catholics as to how we should vote at elections or how we should conduct military campaigns or what part we should take in wars. These things are all outside his sphere of action. His duties have reference to the moral and spiritual side of life. The only instruction he has is-

sued to Ireland or Quebec in regard to the war is his request to pray for a just and lasting peace. There are very nearly a thousand Catholic priests engaged as military and navy chaplains in the British forces, including those of the Dominions. The number of Catholic men requiring so many chaplains may be conservatively estimated at 700,000. If the Pope is to be held responsible for those Catholics who, for racial or other reasons, are accused of having failed to measure up to the average standard of patriotism in war-times, then at least let him have the credit of those many hundreds of thousands of Catholics fighting in the British armies. But, of course, neither the blame nor the praise is due to the Pope. It is physically impossible for any man or any government to control hundreds of millions of people scattered over the world, and interfere with their daily lives in all important matters, in the way the Pope is supposed by his critics to do. I receive a copy of every document issued by the Holy See to the Bishops of the world, and I declare that no Papal instructions in reference to the war have been received other than those which have been published.

When a country, or an integral part of a country, has been in a state of unrest or of internal division during two to ten generations, it unevitably shows weakness in time of war. It is possible, and it should not be surprising, that Italy as a nation has suffered from the conflict between the Church and the State, not because the present Pope has done anything to add to the unrest, but because fifty years of such conflict have depressing and disintegrating effects. Anything that weakens Italy weakens the Allies. The next peace conference will probably have to admit that the Pope's position in Rome is a matter of international, and not merely of national, importance.

Is it patriotic to conduct a campaign which tends to make the Catholics of Canada expect to be harshly treated in case the Allies win the war? The basic fact is that our cause depends on close and loyal cooperation between Catholic nations and Protestant nations, as well as cooperation between Catholics and non-Catholics within each of the Allied nations. Now, in this cooperation the Catholics are not merely private soldiers or in the position of Russian peasants. General Pétain, Commander-in-

Chief of the French Armies, General de Castelneau, who saved the day at Nancy and became Chief of Staff, General Foch, at present Military Adviser of the French Government, and thousands of officers of all ranks, have the welfare of the Catholic Church at heart as truly as they have the defeat of the Germans.

England and the Pope

THE BISHOP OF NORTHAMPTON.

From the Catholic Times.

ALTHOUGH England had from the first recognized that it was to her advantage to keep on good terms with the Pope, in violent contrast to the official attitude had been the behavior of certain individuals, who had been engineering a persistent No-Popery campaign. The Kensitites had been reinforced on this occasion by most unlikely and unaccustomed allies—by Anglican Bishops and Deans and leading Nonconformists, by High Churchmen suspected of Romanizing tendencies and by Evangelicals, by the secular as well as by the religious press, and by public men of some standing as well as the nonentities who were always in search of notoriety. Benedict XV could do nothing to please them. They reproached him with his guilty silence at one stage of the war and with his guilty interference at another. All his good offices on behalf of prisoners and other victims of the war counted as nothing, and when he protested his impartiality he was rudely discredited.

Then there were the disconcerting Russian revelations about some kind of secret treaty between the Pope in the background, an intrigue which had been denied by Italy, but only dissembled by our own cabinet. What was the truth about that shady transaction? Was it credible that John Bull, the very impersonation of fair-play, should have gone behind the Holy Father's back to make these private understandings? English Catholics felt that they had a right to appeal to public opinion

against that sort of thing. It was not only hurtful to Catholic feelings but was a direct injury to our common cause. Catholics had always proclaimed their absolute conviction of the justice and necessity of the war, the Bishops had reaffirmed it time after time in pastoral letters. Catholics had supported the Government in all its war-measures, and had done more than their share in rectifying Continental opinion, which was once so unfriendly towards this country. Catholics came forward in their thousands in the early days of the war when service was voluntary. . . .

The Pope needed no apologists, but Bishop Keating was there to demand an apology from those Bishops and Deans and Nonconformists, from the secular and religious press; an apology not only to the Holy Father for the way he had been treated by them, but an apology to the Catholics of this country [England] and Ireland, to the Catholics of Canada, of the United States, to the Catholic nations of France, Italy, Belgium and Portugal, and to those vast populations in South America either allied to us or upon whose good-will and assistance we largely depend for the happy success of our arms.

He made that protest, not to put the Government in any difficulty, but to save it from its so-called friend, to bring as forcibly as he could before the English people how much the No-Popery cry had already cost this country and how much more the country stood to lose unless the No-Popery campaign was ended there and then. . . .

As patriots, we English Catholics are going to support our Government in the future as we have supported it in the past. As patriots we are going to answer to the Government's call, whether for men or money or sacrifices or personal comfort. We are going to give the best possible example of citizenship to our fellow-countrymen; and as patriots also, we are going to fight for victory and nothing but victory so long as the Government tells us that victory is attainable. But we shall profess openly as patriots our conviction and we shall try to impress that conviction upon our Government, that they ought to look upon the Holy Father as animated by motives that are above suspicion; that they ought to give the most serious attention to all his utterances; that they

ought to recognize and value and encourage his influence as an absolutely unique influence; and that they should never lend themselves to the fatal mistake of rudely slamming the door of conference in the face of the Holy See. We English Catholics will serve our country best not by echoing the parrot cries of the daily secular press. Let us have a view of our own, a Catholic view, and a religious view. The best contribution we can make to the general good, the best contribution to the formation of public opinion, is this: our own unfaltering faith in the integrity and the calm wisdom of the Apostolic See.

France and the Holy See

WHEN Jerusalem fell to the Allied arms, the *Journal des Débats* straightway pointed out that it was now more deplorable than ever that France and Rome could not talk together officially. In his letter to M. Denys Cochin concerning the effect of the establishment of the new Congregation of the Affairs of the Oriental Church, Cardinal Gasparri has shown the readiness of the Holy See to discuss matters in a large spirit, and a determination not to do anything that would in any way diminish the protectorate. That answer and its bearing on the question of the resumption of relations has been duly noted in political circles in France, and letters have appeared in the *Débats* from men who can in no way be suspected of clerical leanings or a desire to see their country go to Canossa. Thus, M. Lazarre Weiller, a Jew and a Deputy of the Left, again pressed the matter in the same paper last April, again comes forward to insist that the question is a political one, and political only, "born of the conditions of our foreign relations, of the rights and the duties they impose upon us in the world, of our age-long traditions, and our destinies in the times to come." The problem of the protectorate has been again forced to the front by the deliverance of the Holy City from the hands of the Turk, and "no one can think of solving the difficulties connected with it apart from the Holy See." It is now for France to act, especially after the letter of Cardinal Gasparri to M. Denys Cochin,

"a reply so perfect that the most exacting Frenchman can find nothing to alter, recognizing and setting forth as it does all our titles with a precision which may serve as a model to our greatest diplomats."

But M. Weiller has other arguments in favor of a resumption of the severed relations with Rome. The misunderstandings arising out of the Pope's note on peace, and the use made of that note by the Central Powers, could, he urges, at least in part, have been avoided if France had possessed at the Vatican one who could have spoken in her name with authority. Whilst acquitting the Holy See of any intention to favor the Austro-German alliance, and regarding the note as a mistake, he points the obvious lesson of the situation: "Since this error, which must injure our cause, could have been to some extent avoided, the merest worldly wisdom prescribed in the most positive way that we should neglect none of the means put at our disposal by the happy initiative of a vigilant and informed statesman like M. Denys Cochin." His letter had been dismissed by one politician as a foolish prank, but it was surely pushing secularist scruples too far to sacrifice to them such a possession as the protectorate. Even Richelieu had treated with the Grand Turk. In the light of considerations like these M. Weiller therefore insists that it would be foolish for France, at a moment when a new order of the world is arising from the battlefields, to keep outside of her action "the most ancient and the most centralized organization, the power of which even those who combat its tendencies cannot deny." Many of the most distinguished members of the Socialist party were strongly of that opinion, and it was for that reason that M. Albert Thomas, on the morrow of his leaving the Ministry, had expressed astonishment that the Government had sent no reply to Pope Benedict's note on peace.

This plea is supported and reinforced by a powerful letter from M. Maurice Vernes, a Protestant professor who has written on the history of religions. He asks his countrymen if they were not thrilled with emotion when they read of the deliverance of the City of David and of Jesus, and tells them how on December 11 Paris and the Vatican were one in thinking of the Crusades,

and in their joy in recalling the glorious memories of those conflicts, which were at once an honor to the Holy See and the nations of the West, and especially to France, who gained from them a prestige and an influence the traces of which have not yet been obliterated. But that prestige and influence so largely depend on the re-establishment of relations with the Holy See that he prefers to make his appeal to reason and self-interest rather than to mere historical sentiments. "How," he asks, "can we discuss with the Vatican the details of the new arrangements which will be involved in the Allied protectorate over Catholics in Jerusalem, Palestine and Syria, who form the special clientele of France, unless we have an accredited representative with the Pope?" M. Vernes is no advocate of a new Concordant between Church and State in France, and is at pains to disclaim any such idea. Like M. Weiller, he argues the question as a political one, upon which depend the prestige of France abroad and her peace at home. "Religion," he says, "is an element of the national life, both in the State and in the commune. Catholics who obey the law have the right to the full exercise of their religion. The French Government ought, therefore, to resume a regular exchange of ideas with the Head of the Church by a re-establishment of contact—that is to say, by the immediate appointment of an ambassador or a *chargé d'affaires* at the Vatican." France, in order to set up a regime of religious liberty, will, when peace has come, have to enter into relations with the Churches, and especially with that of Rome, whose representatives, the Bishops and cures, will not fail to use their right, as it is their duty, of consulting the Vatican. Therein lies a further reason for the Government to have a representative accredited to the Pope, who will expound and defend its policy.